



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,763	03/23/2001	Jose Remacle	VANM212.001AUS	4780

20995 7590 10/21/2002  
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/816,763

Applicant(s)

Remacle

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit

1634



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 6, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-34, and 36-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 23-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-22, 34, and 36-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1634

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Claims 11 and 35 have been canceled without prejudice towards further prosecution.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12, and 34 have been amended. New claims 36-38 have been added.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-22, 34, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1023(a) over Peterson et al. (PCT International Publication NO: WO 95/30026) (November 9, 1995).

Art Unit: 1634

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method of one or more transcriptional factor(s) present in a cell or cell lysate (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

a. binding to an insoluble solid support, double-stranded DNA sequences(s) comprising a specific sequence able to bind the transcriptional factor (Abstract, Claim 1, and Examples, Page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 10);

b. putting into contact the transcriptional factor with the bound double-stranded DNA sequence(s) (Examples, Page 17, lines 11-14);

c. Identifying and/or quantifying a signal resulting from the binding of the transcriptional factor(s) upon the double-stranded DNA sequences (Abstract, Claim 1, and Examples, page 17, lines 16-22).

Peterson et al teach a method, wherein the transcriptional factor is present in solution at concentration lower than 20 nM (Examples, Page 17, lines 31-33).

Peterson et al inherently teach a method, wherein the specific sequence of the double-stranded DNA sequence(s) able to bind with the transcriptional factor is located at a distance of at least about 6-8 nm from the surface of the solid support (This inherence is deduced from the fact that Peterson's method uses a coating on the assay plate with N-avidin, and blocks with blocking buffer, and then uses 40 microliter assay buffer. This volume of buffer inherently makes a space of 6-8 nm from the surface of the plate).

Art Unit: 1634

Peterson et al teach a method for the possibly simultaneous screening and/or quantification of the multiple different transcriptional factors present in a same biological sample upon the same multiwell plate (Claims 3-7, and page 12, line 16 to page 13, line 27).

Peterson et al teach a method, wherein the signal is a non radioactive resulting signal obtained through an enzymatic reaction (page 9, lines 22-24).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method of transcriptional factor selected from AP-1 (Page 12, lines 23-24).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method, wherein the spacer is a double-stranded DNA nucleotide sequence of at least 20 base pairs, preferably at least 40 base pairs (Examples).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method, wherein the double-stranded DNA sequence(s) are bound to a first member of a binding pair able to interact with a second member of the binding pair bound to the surface of the solid support (Abstract and Examples).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method, wherein the double-stranded DNA sequence(s) are covalently bound to the surface of the insoluble solid support (page 11, lines 10-18).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method, wherein the consensus sequence is repeated on the same molecule (Column 10, Table 2).

Peterson et al teach a screening and/or quantification method, wherein the double-stranded DNA sequence(s) fixed on the support surface contain in part or totally one or several

Art Unit: 1634

of the consensus DNA sequences presented in the table 1 (TABLE 1, pages 4-8).

Peterson et al teach a method, comprising the step of identification of at least one characteristic specific of the transcriptional factor activation (Abstract, and Claim 1 and Examples).

Peterson et al teach a method, comprising the steps of screening, quantifying, and/or recovering compounds able to bind to the transcriptional factors or inhibit the binding , when they are put in contact with cells, tissues or organisms (Abstract, and Claim 1 and Examples and page 12, lines 5-30).

Peterson et al teach a method, comprising the steps of screening, quantifying, and/or recovering compounds which modulate the activity of proteins acting on transcriptional factors and then assayed for the binding to and activity of the transcriptional factors (Abstract, and Claim 1 and Examples and page 12, lines 5-30)

Peterson et al teach a method, which comprises the step of identification of transcriptional factors and peptides which are part of their active complex (Abstract and Claim 1).

Peterson et al teach a method, which comprises the step of adding in the cell lysate an externally added transcriptional factor or a compound which is able to bind to the consensus sequence (page 12, lines 5-30).

Peterson et al teach a method, wherein the first member of the binding pair is biotin and the second member is streptavidin (Examples).

Peterson et al teach method of rapid, high-throughput screening (Page 13, lines 10-13).

Art Unit: 1634

Peterson et al do not teach the method, wherein the solid support is an array bearing upon at least 4 spots/square cm of solid support surface and a spacer of at least about 13.5 nm and double-stranded nucleic acid sequences at the concentration of at least 0.01 pmole/square cm of the double-stranded DNA sequence.

However, it is *prima facie* obvious that selection of the specific number of spots and therefore naturally the concentration of DNA/square cm in an array and a spacer of specific length represent routine optimization with regard to sequence, length and compositions of the DNA sequences, size of the transcriptional factor being screened and the requirement of screening speed which routine optimization parameters are explicitly recognized to an ordinary practitioner in the relevant art. As noted *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 at 235,

More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

Routine optimization is not considered inventive and no evidence has been presented that the selection of the specific number of spots/square cm in an array and a spacer of specific length performed was other than routine, that the products resulting from the optimization have any unexpected properties, or that the results should be considered unexpected in any way as compared to the closest prior art.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Peterson et al. (PCT International Publication NO: WO 95/30026) (November 9, 1995) in view of Voytas et al. (U.S. Patent 5,976,795) (November 2, 1999).

Art Unit: 1634

Peterson et al teach method of claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-22, 34, and 36-38 as described above.

Peterson et al do not teach the method, wherein the transcriptional factor is the HIV integrase.

Voytas et al. teach the method, wherein the transcriptional factor is the HIV integrase (Column 2, lines 1-12).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute the method, wherein the transcriptional factor is the HIV integrase of Voytas et al. in the method of Peterson et al , since Voytas et al. state, "The HIV integrase/Ini 1 interaction suggests that retro elements may, in general, recognize specific DNA-bound protein complexes to choose their integration sites (Column 2, lines 9-11)." By employing scientific reasoning, an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute the method, wherein the transcriptional factor is the HIV integrase of Voytas et al. in the method of Peterson et al., in order to improve the process for Screening transcription factors and also in order to achieve the express advantages, as noted by Voytas et al., of an invention which provides retro elements that may, in general, recognize specific DNA-bound protein complexes to choose their integration sites.

***Response to Amendment***

5. In response to amendment, 112(second paragraph) and 102(b) rejections have been withdrawn. However, new ground of 103(a) rejection based on the same prior art has been included.



Art Unit: 1634

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to withdrawal of 102(b) rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments to withdraw 103(a) rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that unexpected results have been obtained as DNA sequences are bound to the support prior to the addition of transcription factor in this instant invention whereas Peterson reference teaches any order of adding transcription factor and the DNA sequences. This argument is not persuasive as MPEP 2144.04 further states, “*In re Gibson*, 39 F.2d 975, 5 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1930) Selection of any order of mixing ingredients is *prima facie* obvious”.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until

Art Unit: 1634


after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph. D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7401.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703) 605-1237.

Arun Chakrabarti,  
Patent Examiner,  
October 17, 2002

  
W. Gary Jones  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600